APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/452,925	12/02/1999	KUNIKAZU TAKAHASHI	FUJA-16.796	1910

7590   09/25/2003

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIC ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK,, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2003* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-78* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 7/10/03.

2.   Claims 1-17 *remain rejected* under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata

in view of Redfern and further in view of Kaply.

3.   Claims 1-17 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata

(USPN 5678054 – filing date 10/5/1994) in view of Redfern (USPN 6078914 – filing date

12/9/1996) and further in view of Kaply (USPN 6112215 – filing date 9/24/03).

2.   **Regarding independent claim 1,** Shibata discloses a device that has a keyboard for

entering string information (abstract, Fig 1; compare with *"an alphanumeric*

entry...information"). Shibata also discloses a display for displaying data contained in memory

(predetermined strings) that are associated with the input (col 1, ln 55-64; compare with *"a*

display...screen"). Shibata also discloses a dictionary (Fig 2, and col 2, ln 51-55). Shibata

discloses the common functions of a dictionary as having a primary data corresponding to a

secondary data. Among this secondary data are synonyms that are linked to the primary data

(Fig 1, col 10-22; compare with *"a word...keywords"*).

Shibata discloses displaying all of the secondary data at once (col 1, ln 58-64). Shibata

does not explicitly disclose cutting out strings in order to search through the dictionary.

However, Redfern teaches extracting relevant terms (col 4, ln 35-43). These terms are then used

to search databases and retrieve associated data when matches are made (col 8, ln 66 – col 9,

ln12). Redfern also discloses the addition of alternative/synonym words to the search (col 3, ln

10-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to combine the inventions of Shibata and Redfern, using Redfern's search method to query the

dictionary and return data to be displayed as disclosed by Shibata (compare with *"an*

alphanumeric information...unit."). Such a combination would have improved data searching

by customizing the search to the user's input, freeing the user from performing multiple searches.

Shibata also discloses a dictionary (Fig 2, and col 2, ln 51-55). Shibata discloses the

common functions of a dictionary as having a primary data corresponding to a secondary.

Redfern teaches extracting relevant terms (col 4, ln 35-43). These terms are then used to search

databases and retrieve associated data when matches are made (col 8, ln 66 – col 9, ln12).

Neither Shibata or Redfern explicitly disclose associating keywords with display screen fields

and extracting and displaying corresponding keywords on the display in their associated and

corresponding fields; however, Kaply teaches a user, who can point out and transfer appropriate

selected data entries from the menu to appropriate fields to produce the completed data entry

screen shown in figure 5. See column 5, lines 34-45. The data entry methods taught by Kaply

demonstrate the associations made between keywords with display screen fields. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified the dictionary methods of Shibata and included the data entry methods of Kaply,

because it would have provided the user the added benefit of having content efficiently delivered

to a display screen.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose using a second set

of keywords to extract a primary keyword. However, Shibata discloses obtaining synonyms as

secondary data from a dictionary (col 1, ln 10-14). Redfern discloses the use of

alternative/synonym words to supplement a database search (col 3,ln 10-14). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Shibata's teaching of

using synonyms for searching supplementing in Shibata's invention. Such a combination would

have expanded the search capabilities of the dictionary by applying its own related secondary

keys to search for a primary key, allowing for more strings to be displayed to a user by following

different relations.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of

Redfern and in further view of Luciw (USPN 5625814 – filing date 5/15/1995).

3.   **Regarding dependent claim 2,** Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose

successively cutting out strings to match in a dictionary. However, Luciw does disclose

analyzing an input string that extracts and checks a string for a meaning. It then successively

extracts strings until the entire string is analyzed (abstract). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Luciw with the

inventions of Shibata and Redfern. Such a combination would have furthered the idea of

customized searching by analyzing the entire string to create an appropriate query.

Claims 3, 6-8, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shibata in view of Redfern and in further view of Microsoft Bookshelf Basics Edition (herein

Bookshelf; Microsoft Corporation (c) 1987-1996).

4.   **Regarding dependent claim 3,** Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose a

dictionary containing conjugated strings. However, Bookshelf teaches a dictionary that does

contain conjugated forms of words (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Bookshelf with the

inventions of Shibata and Redfern. Such a combination would have made the dictionary more

flexible by enabling the search of words in conjugated forms, as was known and typical of

dictionaries in the art at the time of the invention.

5.   **Regarding dependent claim 6,** Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose

designating keywords displayed all at once as provisional primary entries and displaying them in

a first color. However, Bookshelf teaches the display of a set of keywords all at once in a certain

configuration and uses different colored text for certain terms (Figure 3). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the inventions

of Shibata, Redfern, and Bookshelf and use the text display and text colors to indicate

provisional primary entries. This combination would have created a dictionary that a user could

more quickly and easily recognize specific word types (e.g. via color), alleviating any user hassle

of determining these elements by themselves.

6.   **Regarding dependent claims 7-8,** Bookshelf teaches a display field in which a word is

replaced by another word (Figure 4) that is manually selected from a list produced from a first

input (Figure 3), or may be changed via keyboard.

7.   **Regarding dependent claims 14-17,** Bookshelf teaches an input method that enables a

user to input a string and to press enter to confirm the entry (Figure 6). While the user enters

information, display fields are sequentially selected according to the partial input (Figures 7 and

6). Upon the enter instruction, the input is confirmed and the input is completed automatically

(Figure 4). After the input is confirmed, the confirmed output is shown highlighted in a different

color (Figure 4). Although Bookshelf does not explicitly teach the manual confirmation of all

display fields of the primary entry state, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to extend the entry confirmation method as discussed above to

include the confirmation of all display fields. Such a modification would have given the user

more control over the results and would have resulted in a user receiving more personalized

findings.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of

Redfern and in further view of Saito (USPN 6201894 – filing date 1/22/1997).

8.   **Regarding dependent claim 5,** Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose using a

form dictionary to store and retrieve display formats. However, Saito discloses a format

dictionary used to store format and an identifier for associating a format with an input (claim 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the inventions of Shibata and Redfern to include a format dictionary as disclosed by

Saito. Such a combination would have enabled a user to store and recall words in specific

formats.

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of

Redfern and in further view of Fujisawa et al (herein Fujisawa; USPN 4654873 – filing date

10/30/1985) and Houser et al (herein Houser; USPN 5774859 – filing date 1/3/1995).

9.   **Regarding dependent claims 9-13,** Shibata teaches the use of a keyboard for entering

input (abstract). Shibata and Redfern do not explicitly disclose using a handwritten or speech

input. However, Howser discloses evaluating speech input and receiving vocabulary (abstract).

Fujisawa discloses the analysis of handwritten input and converting it into digital form (col 1, ln

45 – col 2, ln 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the inventions of Shibata, Redfern, Houser, and Fujisawa, including

dividing up the handwritten text for analysis in the dictionary. It follow that various input

methods necessitated by handwritten and speech input methods would also have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. This combination would have

extended the invention by allowing multiple input methods, enabling a variety of users to access

the invention (e.g. a user who is unable to use a keyboard).

Response to Arguments

10.   It is respectfully noted that applicant's incorporation of new matter into independent

claim 1, changes the scope of the claim's limitation when interpreted as a whole. Therefore, the

instant rejections have been adjusted accordingly.

Applicant argues on pages 10 & 11, that neither Shibata nor Redfern teach or suggest the

Applicant's claimed dictionary feature for associating keywords with display screen fields and

alphanumeric processing unit feature for extracting and displaying corresponding keywords on

the display in their associated and corresponding fields. It is respectfully noted that a third

reference, Kaply, was inserted into independent 1 to demonstrate the utilization of keywords

with display screen fields.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML
September 12, 2003

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER